

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

POWER INTEGRATIONS, INC., a
Delaware corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR
INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware
corporation, and FAIRCHILD
SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION, a
Delaware corporation,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 04-1371 JJF

**POWER INTEGRATIONS' [PROPOSED] SPECIAL VERDICT AND
INTERROGATORIES TO THE JURY – INFRINGEMENT AND DAMAGES**

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

INFRINGEMENT OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '876 PATENT

Infringement of the '876 Patent

1. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild has literally infringed Claim 1 of the '876 Patent? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

YES _____ NO _____

2. If you answered "NO" to question 1, do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild nevertheless infringes Claim 1 of the '876 patent under the doctrine of equivalents? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

YES _____ NO _____

Willful Infringement of the '876 Patent

3. If you answered "YES" to either question 1 or question 2, do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Fairchild's infringement of Claim 1 of the '876 patent was willful? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

YES _____ NO _____

INFRINGEMENT OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '851 PATENT

Infringement of the '851 Patent

4. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild has literally infringed Claim 1 of the '851 Patent? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

YES _____ NO _____

5. If you answered "NO" to question 4, do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild nevertheless infringes Claim 1 of the '851 patent under the doctrine of equivalents? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

YES _____ NO _____

Willful Infringement of the '851 Patent

6. If you answered "YES" to either question 4 or question 5, do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Fairchild's infringement of Claim 1 of the '851 patent was willful? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

YES _____ NO _____

INFRINGEMENT OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '366 PATENT

Infringement of the '366 Patent

7. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild has literally infringed Claim 14 of the '366 Patent? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

YES _____ NO _____

8. If you answered "NO" to question 7, do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild nevertheless infringes Claim 14 of the '366 patent under the doctrine of equivalents? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

YES _____ NO _____

Willful Infringement of the '366 Patent

9. If you answered "YES" to either question 7 or question 8, do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Fairchild's infringement of Claim 14 of the '366 patent was willful? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

YES _____ NO _____

INFRINGEMENT OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '075 PATENT

10. Do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Fairchild has literally infringed Claim 5 of the '075 Patent? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

YES _____ NO _____

Willful Infringement of the '075 Patent

11. If you answered "YES" as to question 10, do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Fairchild's infringement of Claim 5 of the '075 patent was willful? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

YES _____ NO _____

DAMAGES DUE TO POWER INTEGRATIONS

Damages for Infringement of the '876, '851, '366, and/or '075 Patents

12. If you have found that Fairchild has infringed at least one asserted claim from any of the '876, '851, '366, and/or '075 Patents, do you find by a preponderance of the evidence that Power Integrations suffered actual damages as a result of Fairchild's infringement? (A "YES" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations. A "NO" answer is a finding for Fairchild.)

YES _____ NO _____

13. If you answered "YES" to question 12, state the type and amount of damages you find Power Integrations to have proven by a preponderance of the evidence:
(A) Lost Profits from Lost Sales ('876 and/or '851 patent only):

(B) Past Lost Profits from Price Erosion: _____

(C) Future Lost Profits from Price Erosion: _____

(D1) Reasonable Royalty (in addition to Lost Profits from Lost Sales):

_____ (or)

(D2) Reasonable Royalty (if no Lost Profits from Lost Sales):

TOTAL DAMAGES _____

14. If you answered "YES" to question 12, please state the applicable royalty rates that should apply to each patent you found Fairchild infringed:

'876 Patent _____ '851 Patent _____

'366 Patent: _____ '075 Patent _____

You must each sign this Verdict Form: Dated: _____

_____ (foreperson) _____

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on September 1, 2006, I electronically filed with the Clerk of Court POWER INTEGRATIONS' [PROPOSED] SPECIAL VERDICT AND INTERROGATORIES TO THE JURY – INFRINGEMENT AND DAMAGES using CM/ECF which will send electronic notification of such filing(s) to the following Delaware counsel. In addition, the filing will also be sent via hand delivery:

Steven J. Balick, Esq.
John G. Day, Esq.
Ashby & Geddes
222 Delaware Avenue, 17th Floor
P. O. Box 1150
Wilmington, DE 19899

I hereby certify that on September 1, 2006, I have served by Federal Express, the document(s) to the following non-registered participants:

G. Hopkins Guy, III
Bas de Blank
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP
1000 Marsh Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Attorneys for Defendants
FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR
INTERNATIONAL, INC. and
FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR
CORPORATION

/s/ William J. Marsden, Jr.
William J. Marsden, Jr. (marsden@fr.com)